DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 406 494 UD 031 657

TITLE	Emerging Urban School District Governance Models. Policy Brief.
INSTITUTION	Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.
PUB DATE	Mar 97
NOTE	13p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Education Commission of the States Distribution Center, 707 17th Street, Suite 2700, Denver, CO 80202-3427 (publication UE-97-3), $4 plus postage and handling).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Centralization; Charter Schools; *Decentralization; *Educational Administration; Educational Change; Educational Finance; Educational Vouchers; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Models; Privatization; Profiles; State Departments of Education; State Programs; Urban Areas; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	New Brunswick; *Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

This document provides a brief history of urban school governance and summarizes some of the unique governance structures that have emerged in six American cities and one Canadian province over recent years. By 1920, ward-based systems in most urban areas had given way to systems with a high degree of centralization. These systems were more controllable and efficient, and these large centralized bureaucracies dominated urban education for the first half of the 20th century until the civil rights movement pushed schools to be more responsive to diverse students by returning schools to community control to some extent. In the 1980s, centralization again gained support, but the 1990s have brought reforms that include charter schools, vouchers, and privatization. Profiles are included of the school systems of: (1) Baltimore (Maryland); (2) Chicago (Illinois); (3) Cleveland (Ohio); (4) Milwaukee (Wisconsin); (5) Minneapolis (Minnesota); (6) New Brunswick (Canada); and (7) the District of Columbia. Each profile is organized around a framework that includes legal basis for the reform, district demographics, district leadership, parent and community involvement, changes to collective bargaining, evaluation, costs, and reform results to date. A table displays some of the common elements of the various governance reforms. (Contains 18 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Policy Brief. Emerging Urban School District Governance Models.
-Education Commission of the States

ED 406 494

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. F. Walker
ECS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD031657

UD

ECS EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES

Policy Brief

URBAN

Education Commission of the States
707 17th Street, Suite 2700; Denver, CO 80202-3427

303-299-3600 ■ FAX: 303-296-8332
e-mail: ecs@ecs.org

EMERGING URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICT GOVERNANCE MODELS

Profiles emerging models for urban school governance structures in Baltimore, Chicago, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Minnesota, New Brunswick (Canada) and Washington, DC.

OVERVIEW

This document provides a brief history of urban school governance and summarizes some of the unique governance structures that have emerged in six American cities and one Canadian province over recent years. A profile of each city's (or province's) governance structure is provided. Each profile is organized around a common framework: *legal basis for reform, district demographics, district leadership, parent community involvement, changes to collective bargaining, evaluation, costs* and *results to date*. The seven profiles include Baltimore, Chicago, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, New Brunswick (Canada) and the District of Columbia. Following the profiles is a table displaying some of the common elements of the various governance reforms.

BRIEF HISTORY OF URBAN SCHOOL GOVERNANCE

Throughout American history there has been an ongoing struggle in urban areas about the most effective way of governing urban school districts. In the early part of this century, urban school systems were primarily decentralized — governed and controlled by the local community. Most cities during this era had a ward-based governance system. Each ward in a city elected one or two school board members who were in charge of hiring and firing school personnel, determining what textbooks to use and what curriculum to follow, and deciding where schools would be located and who would build them. Ward-based systems provided a significant opportunity for local participation in school affairs, including participation from stakeholders of diverse ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds. However, these systems also evolved into "breeding grounds for patronage and corruption," with board members granting contracts to friends, taking bribes and engaging in other illegal activities. In addition to the problems with corruption, the completely decentralized, ward-based systems also lacked accountability. It was difficult to determine who was in charge.

By 1920, ward-based systems in most urban areas had given way to systems that were more controllable, efficient and accountable. Reformers during this era argued that concentrating authority in experts would bring a kind of accountability that was absent in a more fragmented and dispersed system. The idea was that regulation, bureaucratization and centralization would equalize education.

These large, centralized bureaucracies dominated urban education for the first half of the 20th century, until the civil rights movement in the 1960s pushed schools to be more responsive to the needs of diverse students. "Many argued that the structure of urban public education was undermining the educational opportunities of poor and minority children," and that the way to resolve this problem was to return schools to decentralized, community control. Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, Chicago and other cities divided their school systems into districts with regional superintendents, and the New York system was divided into 32 community districts.

Centralization gained support again in the early 1980s until concerns began to surface about the inability of state-driven bureaucracies to improve local schools. New proposals to

UD031657

decentralize decisionmaking and involve communities more in their schools were introduced. What emerged was the creation of site-based management and other types of school-based decisionmaking entities and restructuring initiatives.

The 1990s brought charter schools, vouchers and privatization. Advocates for these programs tend to support a more decentralized system where parents have the right to choose the best schools for their children, even if that means using public dollars for private schools, such as in Milwaukee and Cleveland. In a search for greater flexibility and more effectiveness, private companies are running public education systems, and communities (teachers, parents and others) are starting their own public schools based on their educational interests, values and needs. On the other hand, some cities, such as Baltimore and Cleveland, are proposing a more centralized system in which states take over districts that are chronically underperforming, often replacing the existing leadership with state-appointed boards and CEOs. In addition, city governments seem to be getting more involved in urban education systems in this decade. For example, in Chicago the mayor oversees district activities and was responsible for appointing the board and CEO that now run the district. In Baltimore, the mayor and the governor jointly will appoint a new board to replace the elected school board as per consent agreement. In the Canadian province of New Brunswick, school boards have been abolished and governance of the elementary and secondary education system has been reorganized around parent-focused structures at the school, district and provincial levels.

It is uncertain what will happen over the next 10 years, although as Larry Cuban points out in his article, "Reforming Again, Again and Again," it is likely that the reforms being implemented in the 1990s will return again, in one form or another, in future years — just as many of the reforms being tried today are based on reforms of past decades.

GOVERNANCE PROFILES FROM SEVEN URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

1. Baltimore, MD

LEGAL BASIS

- *House Bill 312 — Primary and Secondary Education — New Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners*, January 1997

DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

- 109,980 students

DISTRICT BUDGET

- $733 million

DISTRICT LEADERSHIP

- State and city government actions:
  - *New Board of School Commissioners* appointed jointly by mayor and governor from list submitted by state board of education
- Board composition, terms, conditions and scope of authority:
  - Nine members
  - Three-year term
  - At least four members must have served in a high-level management position; three must possess expertise in education
  - Must hire a CEO to run district (CEO replaces position of superintendent, previously appointed by mayor)
  - Must approve CEO's choices for chief academic officer (CAO) and chief financial officer (CFO) for district
  - Responsible for overseeing result; continued employment of CEO and CAO contingent on improvements in student performance; CFO's employment contingent on effective fiscal management of district
  - Must ensure development of a district transition plan by 9/1/97 and a master plan by 3/1/98
  - Has independent authority to procure goods and services for district (previously was done by city government)
  - Is required to establish a personnel system governing all employees, including qualifications, terms, grievance procedures, hiring, promotion and termination rights; suspension and removal of higher-level employees (e.g., superintendents) governed by this personnel system as well
  - Required to report annually to General Assembly, state board of education, governor and mayor on implementation of transition and master plans

PARENT/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- Fourteen-member parent and community advisory board established to ensure parental involvement in the development and implementation of policies and procedures

CHANGES TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

- New board required to engage in collective bargaining for all employees (previously the board engaged in collective bargaining for certificated employees only and the city engaged in collective bargaining for non-certificated employees)

- Annually, the new board will review collective bargaining agreements to determine if they are consistent with the purposes of the master plan

EVALUATION

- Requires a research unit to perform ongoing evaluation regarding systemic reform and student achievement
- Requires hiring independent consultant(s) to conduct evaluations

COSTS

- An additional $30 million in FY 1998 and $50 million in each of FY 1999-2002 appropriated to support Baltimore City public schools
- Additional funds will be allocated if the city's full-time equivalent enrollment in years 1998-2002 is less than the current enrollment projections for those fiscal years

RESULTS TO DATE

- Bill introduced in January 1997

II. Chicago, IL

LEGAL BASIS

- *Amendatory Reform Act of 1995*

DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

- 407,241 students

DISTRICT BUDGET

- $2.857 billion

DISTRICT LEADERSHIP

- State and city government actions:
  - Chicago School Reform Board of Trustees (*superboard*) appointed by the mayor; replaced existing Chicago Board of Education
  - After four years, mayor appoints members to Board of Education which replaces the *superboard*
  - Mayor appoints president of the *superboard* who, if the mayor wishes, may also serve as CEO; if the president does not serve as CEO, mayor will appoint a CEO
  - Powers of the School Finance Authority (SFA) suspended for the four years the *superboard* is in control; powers of SFA return when Board of Education takes over control
  - Subdistrict councils and superintendents abolished
  - Principals have authority to direct, supervise, evaluate, hire and discipline all school employees and have sole authority to set school hours and schedule staff
  - Statutory language inhibiting privatization with the school system eliminated
- Board composition, terms, conditions and scope of authority:
  - Five members serve a four-year term on the *superboard*
  - *Superboard* responsible for improving the quality of educational services; making the system more cost-effective; developing a long-term financial plan and balanced budget, if possible; directing accountability efforts; enacting policies that ensure an efficient and ethical system; establishing a Local School Council (LSC) advisory board; establishing organizational structures; and providing for other LSCs as necessary
  - *Superboard* required to create an Academic Accountability Council (AAC) to direct school accountability efforts; AAC recommends interventions for underperforming schools; *superboard* takes actions based on recommendations of AAC
  - CEO, rather than full board, given authority to initiate charges against teachers
  - Board required to develop policies to prevent nepotism in the hiring of personnel and the award of contracts

PARENT/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- Principals accountable to elected, parent-dominated LSCs; each school has an LSC consisting of 6 parents, 2 community members, 2 teachers, 1 principal and 1 student (in high schools only); serve 4-year, staggered terms
- LSCs have the power to hire and fire the principal; to approve the budget and receipts and expenditures for all internal accounts; to approve the use of school facilities for civic/social events; and to approve all fundraising activities
- Principal required to share internal audit information with the LSC
- All new LSC members receive training from the Chicago Area Deans of Education (at no cost to the state or school district)

CHANGES TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

- 18-month moratorium on school strikes in Chicago
- Prohibits certain subjects from collective bargaining agreements/decisions (charter schools, contracts with third parties to perform certain services, employee layoffs, class size, staffing and assignment, academic calendars, hours and places of instruction, pupil assessment policies, and the use and staffing of experimental or pilot programs)
- *Superboard* may enter into collective bargaining agreements of up to four years

- Allows for the waiver of any provision in an employee contract

EVALUATION

- Academic Accountability Council responsible for developing and implementing a plan of periodic review of all Chicago public schools

COSTS

- Some of Chicago's state funding given through block grants instead of categorical programs; these funds may be used as the board sees fit
- Guarantees that LSCs will receive no less than $261 million (the amount allocated in FY94-95) in Title I funds each year
- Chicago's property tax levies collapsed into a single operating levy instead of a categorical levy

RESULTS TO DATE*

- Former City Hall staff members dominate the top three levels of management in all the operating departments, resulting in a shared culture with the mayor's office and others at City Hall who believe the school system should be a unit of local government responsive to its constituents, not a "professional enclave" responsive to educational experts; public concerns raised about partisanship, specifically about Chicago's "Democratic machine" controlling the school system
- In the first year of its existence, the *superboard*:
  - approved a four-year balanced budget plan, eliminating a projected deficit of more than $1 billion
  - ratified a four-year collective bargaining agreement with the Chicago Teachers Union, the longest such agreement in Chicago Public Schools' history
  - authorized an $806 million capital improvement plan
  - adopted a multi-year education plan
  - prohibited student athletes from transferring between schools for solely athletic reasons
  - enacted the system's first comprehensive ethics policy
  - authorized a debarment policy to prevent contractor fraud
  - approved measures to assure Chapter 1 funds are used for educational purposes
  - adopted an education crisis policy for emergency interventions in non-functioning schools
  - appointed a Local School Council Advisory Board

* Reflected in this report are only the results/ accomplishments since the 1995 Amendatory Reform Act was passed.

- A September 1995 report by the Department of Education and the University of Chicago argues that there are critical governance issues that the 1995 reform act does not address. They recommend:
  - that benchmarks on institutional accountability be established
  - an emphasis on educational improvement beyond fiscal and managerial efficiency using flexibility to improve learning
  - linking the central office to instructional and curricular issues in the classroom
  - managing structural tension created by a "dual system of governance" (corporate accountability at the top and parent empowerment at the school)

III. Cleveland, OH

LEGAL BASIS

- Legislation is currently being drafted that responds to the report, *Bringing New Skills to the Task of Governing the Cleveland Public Schools*, prepared by Cleveland's Advisory Committee on Governance. The legislation will likely mirror the recommendations made in this report which are outlined below. (Additional governance legislation includes bill to breakup district into five autonomous districts; bill to create charter district)
- Legislation should direct the Cleveland City School District to:
  - ensure the improvement of academic performance
  - continually reduce the cost of non-educational services
  - develop and sustain long-term financial plan
  - meet all court-ordered desegregation requirements
  - redirect district resources to student achievement

DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

- 74,000 students

DISTRICT BUDGET

- $500 million

DISTRICT LEADERSHIP

- Appointed board:
  - Board of Education appointed by the mayor, who selects appointees from a list proposed by a community-based nominating panel; mayor appoints board chairman
  - First four years will be a pilot period (1997-2001); in the year 2001, voters to decide whether to continue with the appointed-board format or return to an elected board
  - Mayor will appoint CEO during pilot period

- Board composition, terms, conditions and scope of authority:
  - Maximum of nine voting members plus one non-voting member, the president of the citywide student council
  - Members of board must reside within the school district
  - Initially, mayor will appoint five members for four-year terms and four members for two-year terms; eventually, all board members will serve four-year terms
  - In 2001, board will be responsible for recruiting and retaining CEO for district, with mayor's approval; CEO will report directly to board and need not possess a superintendent's certificate
  - CEO, with board's approval, will be responsible for appointing district staff, including chief operating officer, chief financial officer, and others as needed; creating an academic accountability plan to measure individual school performance; taking corrective action against underperforming schools; seeking relief, when necessary, from state mandated programs; and appointing an ombudsman to resolve parent/community issues, concerns and recommendations
  - CEO must report to community annually on the performance and progress of the district

PARENT/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- The Advisory Committee on Governance sought community input in the development of its plan through community forums attended by over 400 people
- Community-based nominating panel will be responsible for recruiting and recommending Board of Education candidates; panel will be convened by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI); panel members will serve a two-year term
- Panel will have a maximum of 11 members:
  - three parents/guardians of children in Cleveland Public Schools (CPS)
  - three persons appointed by the mayor
  - one person appointed by the City Council president
  - one teacher selected by the Cleveland Teachers Union
  - one principal selected by the Cleveland Council of Administrators and Supervisors
  - one representative from the business community selected by the Cleveland Tomorrow and Greater Cleveland Growth Association
  - one president of a public or private college or university located within Cleveland, selected by the SPI
  - SPI will serve as a nonvoting member of the committee

CHANGES TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

- No changes discussed in plan

EVALUATION

- No evaluation discussed in plan

COSTS

- CPS budget will be separate from the city budget
- Legislation will give district authority to restructure existing debt
- State will provide funds to facilitate a smooth transition from an elected to an appointed board
- If the state expands voucher program, district will be held harmless financially
- Legislation should provide for a pilot charter school program involving up to six schools

RESULTS TO DATE

- None to date since this is still in the recommendations phase

OTHER PROPOSED GOVERNANCE LEGISLATION

- HB 226 requires public vote to create new board structure
- HB 290 proposes hybrid board composed of appointed and elected members

IV. Milwaukee, WI

LEGAL BASIS

- Milwaukee has been moving towards a more decentralized system; most evident in two areas — the passage of the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program (Section 119.23 Milwaukee Statutes), which provides vouchers for low-income families to send their children to private schools, and the movement away from a centralized budget towards site-based, lump-sum budgeting

DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

- 103,000 students

DISTRICT BUDGET

- $774 million

DISTRICT LEADERSHIP

- Milwaukee is in the process of rethinking its governance structure. An advisory committee will hire researchers to evaluate Milwaukee's current structure and make recommendations for improvements. In addition to looking at proven practices and successful models both within and outside of education, the researchers will listen to people who are affected by the existing governance structure — board members, parents, students, employers, taxpayers, legislators, unions — for

their input and recommendations for improvements. It is likely that the result of this research will be changes in the current governance structure; however, at this time we don't know what those changes will entail.

PARENT/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- Eligible low-income parents can choose to send their child to a private school, free of charge.
- According to a study done by the Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau in 1995, parents of pupils in the choice program showed:
  - more involvement in their new private school than in the previous public school
  - more involvement in their child's education at home
  - higher educational expectations for their child
  - greater satisfaction with their child's education at the private school
  - generally high satisfaction with the information and assistance received from participating private schools

CHANGES TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

- There have not yet been any major changes in collective bargaining in Milwaukee. However, continued interest in the city for both public and private school choice (mainly charters and vouchers, neither of which requires union teachers), combined with the research study to be conducted on a new governance structure, will likely result in some changes in collective bargaining
- The Milwaukee Education Association sued the state of Wisconsin and won in 1996; the court decision was that the modified parental choice program in Milwaukee was unconstitutional, specifically because it would have allowed public funds to be used for private religious schools.

EVALUATION

- The state superintendent required to annually inform families in Milwaukee of the private schools participating in the choice program; submit an annual report to the legislature providing comparative data on academic achievement, daily attendance, dropouts, suspensions and expulsions; and report parent involvement activities of pupils attending private schools under the choice program and pupils attending Milwaukee Public Schools
- The Legislative Audit Bureau required to perform financial and performance evaluation audits of the program

COSTS

- Lump-sum budgeting; schools control about 70% of their budget this year, with the goal of 100% in the next two year; funds based on enrollment and special programs allocated in one lump sum
- Principal and staff decide how to allocate funds
- "Buy back system" allows schools to purchase services from the central office for accounting, printing and some educational services
- Low-income students can apply for vouchers to attend private schools (funding follows the child from public to private school)

RESULTS TO DATE

- Parents who have participated in the choice program generally satisfied and highly involved in their children's education
- Compared with the general Milwaukee public school population, pupils in the choice program:
  - are more likely to be members of minority groups
  - have higher education levels among their parents despite their economic status
  - conveyed less satisfaction with, but more involvement in, their prior public school
  - had lower achievement tests scores prior to their participation in the choice program
- Reports indicate not possible to compare achievement differences between choice pupils and regular public school students

V. Minneapolis, MN

LEGAL BASIS

- In December 1993, Public Strategies Group (PSG), a private firm, hired by the Minneapolis Public Schools (MPS) to act in the capacity of district superintendent; PSG in its third year (fourth contract period) of working with MPS

DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

- 46,837 students

DISTRICT BUDGET

- $553 million

DISTRICT LEADERSHIP

- School board composition, conditions and scope of authority:
  - The MPS school board is elected and composed of seven members
  - Board decision to hire PSG to run the district
  - Board must establish performance objectives for PSG and quarterly assess PSG's progress in meeting these objectives

PARENT/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- Community support and trust is one of PSG's three primary goals

CHANGES TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

- Not aware of any changes; however, Minnesota does have a policy [124A.22, Subd. 2a.(b)] that requires

collective bargaining agreements to be signed by all parties on or before January 15 on even-numbered calendar years. If the contract is not signed by that date, state aid paid to the public employer for that fiscal year shall be reduced. Certain circumstances, outlined in this section, may prevent the reduction of aid.

EVALUATION

- The district regularly gathers survey and school data as a means of improving its performance in the areas of student achievement, learning climate, family involvement, community confidence, the attraction and retention of students, curriculum, instructional effectiveness, and management and administration

COSTS

- Rather than receive the traditional superintendent's salary, PSG is paid only if it meets certain performance objectives established by the board. In the first two contracts, PSG was paid a total of $431,000 of a possible $716,000 (60%) and in the third contract, PSG earned $323,000 of a possible $366,000 (88%)
- Minneapolis board gave PSG "B" grade for leadership during first quarter; "C" grade in second quarter and grades are translated into payments

RESULTS TO DATE

- Most recent reported results (1995-1996 school year):
  - MPS students score significant gains on student achievement tests and posted the district's largest gains in both math and reading scores in the past six years
  - The achievement gap between students in poverty and those with higher incomes narrowed in both reading and math
  - Increases in attendance were reported and suspensions were down
  - Teacher awareness, support and use of the district's curriculum standards increased
- During its first three contract periods (January 1994-June 1996), PSG:
  - Established baseline indicators of performance in curriculum, instructional effectiveness, staff development, safety, family and community involvement and site-based management
  - Assisted MPS in the development of its District Improvement Agenda, which outlines annual objectives which MPS intends to accomplish relative to its three primary goals (student achievement, community support and trust, and management and accountability)
  - Completed curriculum standards in language arts, math, science, social studies and fine arts
  - Developed an assessment policy for student achievement
  - Implemented a strategy for transitioning newly enrolled students into the system
  - Provided day-to-day leadership for district operations
  - Emphasized the alignment of assessment and professional development with the new curriculum content standards
  - Worked on transforming administrative systems — less bureaucratic and more service- and enterprise-focused

VI. New Brunswick (Canada)

LEGAL BASIS

- *Renewed Education Systems Act*

PROVINCE ENROLLMENT

- 135,000 students

PROVINCE BUDGET

- $617.9 million

PROVINCE LEADERSHIP

- Corporate school boards dissolved; their rights, responsibilities and obligations assumed by the Minister of Education.
- A network of parental structures established at the school, district and provincial levels to steer the direction of education (described in Parent/Community Involvement section below)
- Maintains two educational divisions, one for each linguistic community; each division has legislated responsibility for educational programs and program delivery
- Appointed board composition, conditions and scope of authority:
  - Minister appoints members to two provincial boards of education (one anglophone and one francophone)
  - Provincial boards composed of one parent representative from each district and three to five ex-officio members chosen from among educational and community leaders
  - Provincial boards meet quarterly; advise minister on educational and expenditure plans, curriculum, provincial achievement and standards of performance; provide a communication link to parents and school communities; participate on superintendent selection committees; have veto power over hiring and reappointment of superintendents and over hiring of directors of education; establish criteria for selection of school personnel; and establish direction for the admission and promotion of pupils in schools

PARENT/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- Every school has a School Parent Committee (SPC); members elected through parent organizations; each

committee required to have a minimum of six members and a maximum of 12; over 50% of members must be parents who are not employees of the school
- Chair of the SPC sits on the selection committee for hiring the principal
- Responsibilities of SPCs:
  - advise principal on matters directly affecting students in the community school
  - provide a communication link with parents
  - participate in setting school mission
  - establish school improvement plans
  - collaborate in establishing school policies related to education, culture and language
  - review results of School Performance Reviews
  - provide other suggestions as needed
- Each district has a District Parent Advisory Council that advises superintendent on matters that directly affect the school system and the school community; provides a communication link with parents in each school; participates on selection committee for school principals; have veto powers over hiring of principals and teachers; advises the district on multiple educational and administrative issues, including assuring that the curriculum and instruction reflect the interests and needs of the community; and provide input into the annual performance review of the district superintendent and director of education

CHANGES TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

- None found in Act

EVALUATION

- Not discussed in Act

COSTS

- Administrative restructuring will result in cost savings:
  - the staff at the Department of Education reduced by 30 full-time-equivalent positions
  - the province shares administrative support services across its 18 school districts (e.g., transportation, building maintenance, financial services, etc.)
  - school district staff positions reduced from 469 to 346 (97 administrative and 26 educational positions)
- Legislation guarantees that funding for education is divided equitably between the two official language groups

RESULTS TO DATE

- Started electing members to the new school parent committees, district parent advisory councils and provincial boards of education
- Have been discussing Education Act issues with the boards, the union, and various interest groups to solicit feedback and recommendations prior to introducing legislation

VII. Washington, DC

LEGAL BASIS

- Congressional order, pursuant to Public Law 104-8, declaring a state of emergency in the District of Columbia public school system

DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

- 80,450 students

DISTRICT BUDGET

- $615.8 million

DISTRICT LEADERSHIP

- Appointed board/removal of existing superintendent
  - Emergency Transitional Education Board of Trustees appointed by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority (Authority)
  - Existing elected Board of Education should provide input, advice, counsel, guidance, reports and recommendations to the newly established Board of Trustees
  - The services of the existing superintendent no longer required; a CEO will be appointed by the Authority to replace superintendent; subsequent CEOs will be hired by the Board of Trustees
- Board composition, terms, conditions and scope of authority:
  - Nine trustee members — five general appointees, one parent, one teacher, the district CEO and the president of the District of Columbia Board of Education
  - Each Board of Trustee member serves until June 30, 2000 at which time the Board of Education shall exercise its full authority
  - With the exception of CEO, member of the Board of Trustees are not paid for their work on the Board
  - The Board of Trustees adopts rules, bylaws, and regulations governing its activities
  - The Board of Trustees has all the authority, powers, functions, duties, responsibilities, exemptions and immunities of the Board of Education
  - The authority of the Board of Education delegated to the Board of Trustees; the Board of Education has a vote on all matters coming before the Board of Trustees through its president who is an appointee to the Board of Trustees
  - The Board of Trustees serves as the state educational agency for the District of Columbia
  - CEO serves as state superintendent of education and appoints, with Board of Trustees approval, all officers and employees needed to run the district

- Board of Trustees oversees all facility planning, construction, improvement, repair, rehabilitation and maintenance
- CEO must hire an officer to provide liaison, administrative support and information to the Authority, the Board of Trustees, the Board of Education, and the Commission on Consensus Reform in the District of Columbia public schools

- Board of Trustees and CEO authorized and empowered to:
  - improve the quality of educational services
  - ensure ongoing academic improvement
  - establish a school improvement and recognition process
  - streamline and strengthen the management of the system
  - create a responsible school-based budgeting process
  - reduce the cost of non-educational services and implement cost-saving measures
  - develop a long-term financial plan
  - develop the long-term reform plan outlined in the District of Columbia School Reform Act of 1995
  - develop programs to ensure every student achieves basic literacy and possesses knowledge and skills to think critically and communicate effectively by grade 8
  - lower the dropout rate
  - develop districtwide assessments
  - establish procedures to ensure that teachers are made accountable for the performance of their students
  - make recommendations to improve community, business and parent involvement
  - assess opportunities to increase student involvement in extracurricular activities
  - establish procedures to ensure students are ready for and capable to enter the workforce
  - enact policies to ensure that the system is ethical and efficient

PARENT/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- Board of Trustees shall make recommendations to improve community, business and parent involvement
- At least one business member and one parent are voting members of the Board of Trustees

CHANGES TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

- Officers and employees appointed by the CEO shall be appointed and paid without regard to any provision of the District of Columbia Code governing appointments and salaries
- Notwithstanding any other provision of law or contract, Board of Trustees authorized to promulgate rules establishing procedures governing the layoff or reduction in force of employees of the school system and the recall of such employees

EVALUATION

- At a minimum, Board of Trustees must report annually to the Authority and the public on its performance and progress in meeting its goals and the effects their efforts have had on the operation and administration of the system and performance of students, teachers and staff of the public school system

COSTS

- CEO submits annual budget to the Board of Trustees for approval; the Board of Trustees then submits budget to the mayor and the Authority for review and approval
- School-based budgeting process will be developed to refocus resources on student achievement
- Where necessary, privatization of services may be implemented in order to save costs

RESULTS TO DATE

- Very new reform, no results discussed yet. A comprehensive report, however, was developed by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Authority in November 1996. This report provides specific details and statistics on the status of DC's public schools prior to and at the time the emergency takeover was enacted and offers "foundations for the future," which are the recommendations for improving DC's schools that guided the content of the public order and the structure for its implementation.

COMMONALITIES AND DIFFERENCES ACROSS CITY GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES

	Baltimore	Chicago	Cleveland	Milwaukee	Minneapolis	New Brunswick	DC
New appointed board replaces existing board	X	X	X			X	
Two boards - new and existing elected							X
No changes to board structure				X	X		
Board appointed by mayor		X	X				
Board appointed jointly by mayor and governor	X						
"CEO" (non-educator) hired instead of a traditional superintendent	X	X	X				X
Private company hired in place of Superintendent					X		
CEO performance tied to contract	X				X		
Board responsible for improved performance	X						
Required parent representation on appointed boards	X	X	X			X	X
Changes to collective bargaining	X	X					X
Additional dollars allocated to support new system	X		X				
Pilot/transitional period to establish new system		X	X				X
After pilot period, return to elected board							X
After pilot period, establish a different board structure		X					
Increased powers/authority given to schools		X		X			
New entity established in charge of accountability							X
Requires an external/neutral evaluator		X					
System has been in existence long enough to see results		X		X	X		
Vouchers and/or charter schools specifically mentioned		X		X			
Changes to school budgets and/or district's resource allocation to schools				X		X	X
Legislation pending regarding new governance structure	X		X			X	
New governance system in place	*	X			X		X

*Consent decree null and void unless legislation is passed, signed by governor and budget appropriated.

REFERENCES

Advisory Committee on Governance. *Bringing New Skills to the Task of Governing the Cleveland Public Schools*, printed by the Cleveland Summit on Education, Cleveland, Ohio. 1996.

Canadian Education Association. Addendum to the *News Bulletin*, Vol. 24, No. 11, February 1996.

Canadian Education Association. *News Bulletin*, Vol. 24, No. 12, March 1996.

Hess, G. Alfred. *Chicago's New Perspective on District Management*. Commentary in *Education Week*, November 29, 1995.

Chicago Schools Legislation. *Summary of Chicago School Reform Package* (CCR#1 to HB206). 1995.

Consortium on Chicago School Research. *Charting Reform in Chicago: The Students Speak*. 1996.

Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform. Brief profiles of Milwaukee, Boston, Cincinnati, and Cleveland school systems. December 1996.

Cuban, Larry. "Reforming Again, Again, and Again," *Educational Researcher*, 19 (1), January-February 1990.

District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority. *Children in Crisis: A Report on the Failure of DC.'s Public Schools*. November 1996.

District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority. *Resolution, Order and Recommendation Concerning District of Columbia Public School System*. November 15, 1996.

De-Grading, Jola Education Monthly, May-June 1996.

Lockyer, James. *A Renewed Education System for New Brunswick*, speech downloaded from the Internet. February 1996.

Maryland House Bill 312- *New Baltimore City Board of Commissioners*. 1997 Regular Session (unofficial copy).

Milwaukee Public Schools Governance Status Report. January 1997.

Mirel, Jeffrey E. *What History Can Teach Us About School Decentralization*. Presentation to the Chicago Principals Association. March 23, 1990.

The Public Strategies Group, Inc. *The Minneapolis Public Schools Client Summary*. 1996.

Toulmin, Charles. *Milwaukee Parental Choice Program*. Madison, WI: Legislative Fiscal Bureau. 1996.

Wong, Kenneth K., Robert Dreeben, Laurence Lynn, Robert Meyer, & Gain Sunderman. *System-wide governance in the Chicago Public Schools: Findings and recommendations for institutional design*. A report on school governance from the Department of Education and the Irving B. Harris Graduate school of Public Policy Studies, The University of Chicago. 1995.

ECS *Policy Brief* provides a forum for discussion of emerging policy ideas and issues.

© Copyright 1997 by the Education Commission of the States (ECS). All rights reserved.

The Education Commission of the States is a national, nonprofit organization that helps governors, legislators, state education officials and others develop policies to improve student learning at all levels. A bipartisan organization, ECS was formed in 1965, and is located in Denver, Colorado. It is ECS policy to take affirmative action to prevent discrimination in its policies, programs and employment practices.

Copies of this *Policy Brief* are available for $4 plus postage and handling from the ECS Distribution Center, 707 17th Street, Suite 2700, Denver, Colorado 80202-3427, 303-299-3692. ECS accepts prepaid orders, MasterCard, American Express and Visa. All sales are final. Refer to publication number UE-97-3.

ECS is pleased to have other organizations or individuals share its materials with their constituents. To request permission to excerpt part of this publication either in print or technologically, please write or fax Josie Canales ECS, 707 17th St., Suite 2700, Denver, CO 80202-3427; fax: 303-296-8332.

Postage and handling charges: Up to $10.00, **$3.00**; $10.01-$25.00, **$4.25**; $25.01-$50.00, **$5.75**; $50.01-$75.00, **$8.50**; $75.01-$100.00, **$10.00**; over $101.00, **$12.00**.